THE MEETING

OF THE

EAST AND THE WEST

Permission for translations will be given
BY
THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
Adyar, Madras, India

THE MEETING

OF THE

EAST AND THE WEST

BY

C. JINARĀJADĀSA, M.A. (CANTAB.)

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE

MADRAS 1921 LONDON

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY

" WHO's the man that says we're all islands shouting lies to each other across seas of misunderstanding ? " Thus spoke once a true observer of men. Never was it truer than with regard to the men and women who live in the two great halves of the world, the East and the West. Dreams are everywhere the same, and hearts everywhere beat to the same rhythm; ignorance, lust and greed, under dark skins or fair skins, show the same ugly visage. It was said by a wise woman of France: " *Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner*—To understand all, is to pardon all." From one step higher whence to survey life, the lover of Humanity will say: " To understand all is to *admire* all."

" O, east is east, and west is west, and never the twain shall meet." So Kipling is misquoted a thousand times, for that is just what he did *not*

say; that is the sentiment which he places in the mouth of the blind observer of men. His own true sentiment comes in the third and fourth lines which none remember to quote:

But there is neither east nor west, border, breed nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth!

When two strong men stand face to face! There we have the real key-note. When true men or women, strong in their devotion to duty, flawless in their self-sacrifice, meet face to face, then, though they be Indian or Briton, Turk or Jew, they greet each other in friendship and reverence as knights pledged to one Ideal, as the servants of one Master. There is no East or West for them, but only one unchanging North, a Dhruva, an "immovable" Pole Star.

It is true that for generations the East and the West have misunderstood each other. But that is only because not "strong men" but weak men of either continent have talked to each other. The occidental, till quite lately, has looked upon the oriental as did Kinglake in his travels, narrated in *Eothen*: "A mere oriental, who, for creative purposes,

is a thing dead and dry—a mere mental mummy that may have been a live king, just after the flood, but has since lain embalmed in spice." And in return, the oriental has looked upon the occidental much as Du Maurier tells us that the French looked upon a certain type of Briton: "It was stiff, haughty, contemptuous. It had prominent front teeth, a high nose, a long upper lip, a receding jaw; it had dull, cold, stupid, selfish green eyes, like a pike's, that swerved neither to right nor left, but looked steadily over people's heads as it stalked along in its pride of impeccable British self-righteousness." Though Kinglake was right, though the French are right, they are right only with respect to a few, those few who misrepresent their race and its high traditions. As it requires a strong man to call out strength, so it requires nobility to call out what is noble. The strong and the noble of the East and the West know how to recognise each other, and to form ties of friendship, leaping every barrier of ignorance and mistrust.

The East and the West would not be coming together, except that they are guided to come together, because they can help each other. The philosophy

of the East and the chivalry of the West are now both necessary for the world's welfare. The two continents are indeed coming together, as we shall now see.

CHAPTER I

IN THE IDEALS OF CITIZENSHIP

With the surging forces of Democracy all about us, it is necessary once in a while to see where exactly we are drifting. Conservatives and Radicals, Constitutionalists and Bolsheviks, have all one dream, and that is the perfect State. In theory, they are all working with one aim; and each party naturally proclaims its policy as the one and only panacea for all evils. Both the East and the West are now busy attempting to put the world in order. Certainly the world badly needs it; but will our present policies bring about Utopia, or only make confusion worse confounded?

Now all political gospellers realise that the crux in Reconstruction is the individual; if there is to be better Government, it can no longer be the result of the pronouncement of one individual, a monarch, or of a small group, an oligarchy, but only by the

co-operation of all the citizens. Therefore, what the citizen is, that the State is. If the citizen is lethargic, and exercises his political rights only once in a while, merely when he must mark his voting paper, the State is run by a clique of "bosses," who exploit the State for their private benefit. If, on the other hand, the citizen is wide-awake, and insists on being listened to by political "leaders," abuses are little likely to arise, and the best Government available will be the result. No ideal State is possible without the ideal citizen, and so the first matter to deal with is, What makes a citizen?

On this matter, the East and the West stand sharply in contrast. This contrast is due to the two different modes of viewing the individual. To the East, the individual is *par excellence* the heavenly citizen, that is, one whose true relation is to a City of God. Hence the idea of Duties pervades all possible relations among individuals, and the thought of "right," as a power inherent in the individual, remains in the background. In the West, from Greece downwards, the idea of Rights has been far more emphasised, with the consequence that the individual has a different and more objective attitude to life.

We need not inquire of academic Jurisprudence whether Rights and Duties are or are not dissociable; taking the ordinary conduct of men and women, we find that where the citizen thinks of himself by his *rights*, he becomes quickly a political factor, while where he thinks primarily of his *duties*, and not of his rights, he is inclined to consider himself as having more a moral value than a political. Either mode of thought, when put into practice, leads to practical evils; in India, the emphasis on the citizen as having more duties than rights has led to a submission to oppression and to an acquiescence in civic and national backwardness. This follows from the thought that duties are divinely distributed, and the obligation as to a duty comes on each individual not from man but from God. It is therefore not man's but God's to punish an infringement of duty. The natural result is a tolerance of injustice, instead of a rebellion against it. The private virtues of patience and renunciation are developed, while an evil attitude of *laissez faire* saps the character. Manliness tends to disappear at the expense of a pseudo-saintliness.

On the other hand, we see a different set of evils arising in western lands, from the emphasis laid on

rights at the expense of duties. The character becomes pushing and domineering, each desiring his "place in the sun". A keen competition results from one and all desiring his "place in the sun," and this competition leads to a hard conception of life. "Get on or get out" is the American business man's summing up of the doctrine of rights; it is what Germany has learnt, in her attempt to get her place in the sun.

Now that the East is clamouring for rights, it is noteworthy that the best of the West is rather tired of them. The West has experimented for nearly two centuries with political institutions based on rights, and while still it is preaching the gospel of universal suffrage, it knows that mere votes alone will accomplish little. It is not the vote, but the conscience behind the vote, which counts. Therefore we find large bodies of men and women in the West putting aside the political lever, and trying to fashion a new one out of ethics. In other words, the attempt in the West towards a Reconstruction is not by building new political parties, but by examining all problems dissociated from every political bias, and by men and women thereafter banding themselves together not

to fight for rights, but to sacrifice themselves to duties.

It is here that the East can add her strength to the great Reconstruction. The East is steeped in the idea of Duty. But hitherto the idea of duty has involved a negativity in practice, for where social and political evils have been concerned, the rule for the individual's conduct has been: "It is not my Dharma." But as the East now organises herself to fight for rights, the fight can become less one for the rights of man and more for the rights of God.

Slowly the East and the West are meeting on a common platform of action, for both duties and rights, when truly conceived, lead to Righteous Action. Each can strengthen the other with the wisdom which each has gained from its mistakes and failures, from its dreams and ideals. Both are slowly coming to a realisation that something exists in man which is more fundamental in his nature than his duty or his right. This is a free, voluntary gift of man himself to a Work. So long as the citizen thinks of his work as arising from a duty, he is only partially effective; so long as he thinks of that work as the expression of a right, he equally fails to bring out

the full quota of power in himself. But when the individual, man or woman, eastern and western, transcends the idea of duty and right, and comes to feel his own Individuality, then dawns a new conception of life, and with it the assurance of a new power. It is the individual of the future who looks upon the gift of the best of himself to his surroundings as not imposed from without, either by religion or tradition or culture, but as the expression of his inmost self. The world's work of regeneration is for him not a God's work, in which he thankfully joins, but his own work. He visualises the world, both here and hereafter, not in terms of happiness for himself now and a heaven's bliss to come later, but as the mirror of his own true deeds.

This is the new ideal of citizenship towards which the East and the West are converging. All the religious ideals of the East and West will contribute to it. Men will be good and will do only good, not for God's sake, nor for man's sake, but because the self, his man's self or her woman's self, cannot be or do otherwise. Then the citizen will be both the ruler and the ruled; he will give the best of himself to govern, and the best of himself to obey. The

world will be a finer world because both the East and the West join to make it better. Except that He, who made all, wants both for His plans, would they have been fashioned so distinct from each other? Except that He now wants them both in a common work, would He have brought them together as now, with rail and with telegraph, with machinery and with trade? To dwell in a city where all men and women know the Self within them is whither the One Self of all is leading the world. Then the citizen of the East and the citizen of the West will know that they share one supreme attribute, which is that true world-citizenship of those who know only of one World, one Humanity, one Self, "without a second".

CHAPTER II

IN THE MEASURING OF MAN

It was a philosopher of Greece who said that "Man is the measure of things". He meant by this graphic phrase that truth as an abstraction has no value, and that all things—ideas, forces or deeds—have a reality only in so far as they have a relation to man and his welfare. The emphasis laid upon the individual as the criterion of truth, and as the pivot on which life must turn, produced in Greece a very high conception of the citizen; her statesmen realised that every ideal scheme for the State depended for its success on the amount of idealism in the individual citizen. It requires little observation to see that, as is the individual, so is the possibility of achievement for his country.

There is a marked contrast in the conception of the individual by eastern culture and by western culture. In the hoary culture of India, the individual is

always a spiritual entity; in the prevalent culture of the West, the individual is a thing of matter, a "fortuitous concourse of atoms," which exists for a time, and then disperses. For India, the individual is a Dehin, the possessor of, or a dweller in, a body; for the West, he is a Deha, the body itself. The East therefore conceives the individual as composed of layers or "sheaths" of consciousness, called Koshas; he is One Self, but he has several bodies to function through—a bliss body, a conceptual mind body, a concrete mind body, a vital body, and a body of material substance gathered from food. But in the hitherto accepted philosophy of the West, the individual, the entity whom we call "man," is a temporary phenomenon, an effect and not a cause; he arises out of chemical and electrical changes produced in the body and the brain. "The brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile," is the clue to the materialistic conception of man in the West.

This conception of the West of the individual as merely a bubble on the sea of existence—a bubble which is bound to burst after "the allotted span of life" of some three score years and ten is over—is at

the root of all western civilisation, whether in education, economics, politics, hygiene or "efficiency". Every scheme of legislation or education visualises the citizen as the material man, who begins at birth, and who ends at death. Once the body is dead, there is no citizen to help, or to be helped by, the State.

It goes without saying that, if the West were to change its present materialistic conception of the individual, there are bound to be vast changes in every department of life. If man is not merely a consciousness due to an interaction of secretions, but has some extra-physical nature, then the idea of the citizen expands. We must then legislate not only for his physical health, but also for his spiritual well-being; a spiritual hygiene and sanitation, as well as a material, will then have to find a place in our Ministers' budgets. We shall need, in our educational system, to make the crown not the Master of Arts but the Master of Soul Experience. "His Excellency" will be really that person who possesses those soul qualities which excel in number and volume what the rest have, and "the Governor" will be he who can govern not only the bodies of

others but also their passions, minds and souls. All this new order of things follows, when the individual is seen as other than the bodily man.

The East has ever held the individual to be a super-physical man. And on this matter the West is just beginning to travel eastwards. For the last three quarters of a century, the gospel of the educated man in the West has been that of materialism. But of late this materialistic philosophy has been undergoing very remarkable changes. It was our physiologists in the past who declared, in Carlyle's contemptuous words, that "soul is synonymous with stomach"; it is the psychologists of to-day who are adding to the individual's visible bodily nature an invisible superstructure. We are now told that the individual, whom we note in our daily intercourse, is only a part of the true individual; there is a hidden part to him. We only see so much of him as he shows "above the threshold"; but there is a part of him that is subliminal, *i.e.*, "below the threshold". This subliminal self is now being investigated with remarkable zeal by "psychoanalysts"; almost every month new books are appearing in England and America with records

of investigations and experiments. The unseen individual is not being catalogued into Koshas or "sheaths," as in India; but he is being divided into a "foreconscious" and an "unconscious," with all kinds of "complexes," with psychical processes called sublimations, regressions, transferences, etc. Freud of Vienna, and Jung and Adler of Zurich, are the prophets of the new vision; their disciples are springing up in every land, and Psychoanalysis has become even a society fad.

The old idea of mind and thought as originated by the brain has gone by the board utterly. To the latest and up-to-date psychologists, the brain is merely the recorder of thought, often of thought originated by others. Thus we are told that the "unconscious" behind each individual's conscious part of himself is linked to a "world unconscious," which retains the experiences of past generations. Hence, we are told, it often happens that the judgment and achievement of a man's "unconscious" is sometimes superior to that of his own realisable consciousness. The "World Soul" of Emerson, which is the One Self of the Upanishads, is reappearing as an extremely able and wise "World-Unconscious".

Names matter little; the facts discovered do. And modern psychology, starting out with its liver-bile analogy as to the origin of thought, is now offering us a new conception of the individual as the consciously open window to a vast ocean of light of a transcendent World-Consciousness.

The moment that this new conception of the individual becomes the accepted gospel of our universities and schools, who can prophesy the changes which will take place in education, in statecraft, and in public life? It does not require a great prophetic vision to see all these changes as appearing within a quarter of a century. For when Science speaks out of the multitude of her facts, the world must obey. If Science once spoke hastily as to man some decades ago, she spoke from the facts she then knew. New facts have come to light, and so she must speak again, correcting her errors due to limited knowledge. She is now speaking, and her message is slowly ushering in a new conception of the individual, where the generalisations and intuitions of the East and the detailed knowledge of the West meet, to show man as other than the body, and as the embodiment of a World-Soul.

CHAPTER III

IN STATECRAFT

It is said sometimes that the East is the land of Autocracy and the West that of Democracy. The statement is partly true, but also partly false. In eastern lands, kingship is certainly the embodiment of statecraft, but there never has been any full autocracy. For instance, the public opinion of citizens and the censure of spiritual instructors have always been powerful restraints on the autocracy of Indian Kings. Subjects need not rebel, with formal acts of rebellion, to bring pressure to bear on autocratic rulers; there is a moral pressure sometimes more powerful than that of armies. This moral pressure was never far away from the Indian King, who was part of the system of statecraft. The King has never been the head of the State as if external to it, and so having an independence of it, and full control of it; he was the head of the State in exactly

the same way that the skull and brain form the head of the body, but are not external to it. Furthermore, there have always been in India various representative institutions, not excluding a few republics, like the clan organisations in North India some five centuries before Christ. India does tell us too of the deposition of a King by his subjects. There may have been autocracy in India, but it was always a limited autocracy. Still, it can be said that, in general, the East has hitherto accepted Autocracy. As all know, she is demanding to-day, to try the experiment of Democracy.

In western lands, especially to-day, democracy may be said to be the expression of the State's energies. Of course a democratic country may have a King, as have Britain or Italy; but the presence of a monarch does not imply that he exercises the powers of rule. Equally, on the other hand, a country may be a republic in name, with a President exercising almost autocratic power. But in the West, the idea of democracy connotes the power in a body of electors to elect whom they will to the posts of power. In U.S.A., this elective power is exercised not only over the Legislature, but also sometimes over the minor

judiciary and the local executive, as when the people elect the County Judge and the County Sheriff. Broadly speaking, the characteristic of democracy is the power to elect those who are to administer the State's energies.

There is taking place just now a most interesting series of political changes which are affecting both East and West, and are bringing them nearer to each other. In the East, the idea of democracy is quickly gaining ground, and the peoples are training themselves in the exercise of elective power. While the East is thus modelling itself on the West, all unknown to itself the West is modelling itself on the ancient East, and experimenting with some forms of statecraft found most successful in the East. Now one essential element in autocracy is that the ruler appoints the heads of the departments of the State, and the people acquiesce in the ruler's judgment. In England, an outwardly monarchical country, the people elect the head of the Government, the Prime Minister, and it is he, and not the King, who appoints the heads of departments, though in name the King does so, and the Ministers "kiss hands" on taking the seals of office. But on the other hand, in a nominally

democratic country like the Republic of the United States, the President alone appoints the Ministers, and the appointments do not need to be ratified by the people's representatives. The President's judgment is accepted by the people as the best judgment of the Nation on the matter.

It is strange that, in spite of democratic ideas, the people, both in U.S.A. and England, have refrained from interfering with the powers exercised by the supreme Executive, on this matter of who are the best people to direct the energies of the Nation. The Legislature must ratify any fundamental changes of policy; but the carrying out of policies is left in the hands of the President's or the Prime Minister's nominees.

This of course is a flat contradiction of the principle of direct election. But not only does it work best in practice in State administration, it is being found best in other fields also. Let us consider what is happening with regard to the administration of municipalities. According to democratic theory, the best administration is that by a body of councillors elected by the citizens. The councillors elect various committees and sub-committees, to supervise municipal

departments, and the combined wisdom of the city fathers is taken as the summit of wisdom obtainable in the city. But it is now being found out that the elective principle, when carried out in practice, does *not* produce the best municipal administration, if we mean by "best" that which gives greatest comfort to the citizens for the least expenditure of money. Slowly, but inevitably, a new movement is growing in the West, specially in the U. S. A., of what is called the "Commission" form of city administration. The councillors think of the city's affairs as a business like any other business, and they advertise for one or more experts to "run the city". They give the expert an adequate salary, hand over to him full authority over the departments, and keep away from interfering with his work. Of course, as finally the employment of the expert or his dismissal is in the Council's hands, he must carry out its policy; but, when once they have given him the policy, they leave him in full command to carry it out. In other words, it is being recognised that the person or persons most capable of administering a city are not those elected, but those appointed according to their past experience and achievement.

The theory of election is slowly giving way in the West to the theory of appointment, while the East is clamouring to experiment with the theory of election. Of course, if the person who appoints were to have the best wisdom obtainable in the Nation, appointment by him would be surely the most sensible; if the electors by voting were always to select the most expert person, nothing could be better. But the judgment of Kings in practice often fails, while the judgment of the people is not always *Vox populi, Vox Dei.* What is good in the elective theory is that every individual in the Nation shares in its responsibilities and privileges, and so the Nation's life slowly becomes the realisation of the best dreams of each citizen. But what is unsurpassable in the principle of appointment is that, if a work is to be done, the expert is the best person to do it, and the judgment of inexperts does not make for the selection of the expert.

Autocracy is becoming as "extinct as the Dodo". But that does not mean that the idea of appointment has been substituted by the idea of election. Kings and rulers may henceforth everywhere be "limited monarchs," but no amount of democracy can limit the capacity or judgment of a ruler. If a king is

truly what his name signifies, a "cunning" or knowing and wise man, his experience is better than that of an inexpert Demos.

The East has an instinctive belief in kings as heads of States, and does not think it impossible that there may be a "divine right" of kings, *i.e.*, a right to serve the State in its most onerous position, won by less onerous services well and truly performed in past lives. The West may have lost faith in kingship, but its faith in experts is growing. The West and the East are slowly meeting on this matter of the experts who are to administer a Nation's affairs. Both are beginning to see that, while Democracy has come to stay, it must also, if Democracy is to be serviceable and not destructive, be a "limited" Democracy.

CHAPTER IV

IN ECONOMICS

ANYONE who travels in western lands and inquires why the West with all its wealth has still so much of poverty and misery will quickly "come up" against the land problem. Whatever is the problem tackled —Capital, Labour, Exchange, Revenue—finally the enquirer comes to the land. It is a little strange that, till recently, the Science of Economics has dealt with many problems, but little with this main problem. It was Ruskin who sarcastically pointed out to the professors of Political Economy that the Greek word Economics meant "the Science of Making Homes," and that the professors should be more busy about multiplying homes for citizens, and discuss less mediums of exchange. That the Land Problem is the coming problem will quickly be grasped by anyone who is in touch with the dreams of Labour. "Nationalisation" once implied all kinds

of Socialistic impossibilities, but we are by now used to the nationalisation of posts, telegraphs and telephones, and, in many countries, of railways, gas and electricity also. The great problem now in Britain, over which many a strike has occurred, is the nationalising of the mines; though the owners have so far won, the Labour Party of Britain is definitely pledged to the nationalisation of mines. And after that, only a few steps lead to the greatest upheaval of the basis of western civilisation, the nationalisation of the land. To this too the British Labour Party is pledged, because every social reformer finds sooner or later that the ownership of the land by private individuals means power by them over the people, directly or indirectly. Private individuals now own the land. By privilege or by industry, it is possible to "make a corner" in land. That is how a small owner becomes a large one. The ownership of the land gives power, especially over the destiny of the masses who have no capital, and whose life depends on employment by those who are controlling capital. It is becoming more and more recognised that the economic slavery of the workers is bound up with the land problem, and that only by nationalising the

land can the masses find an economic stability. This doctrine may be questioned by many, but it is the gospel of Labour.

In India, before the British came, there was a land system which fundamentally prevented the creation of large estates. Even where there were great "landlords," they were not truly lords of the lands, for they had little or no rights of alienation. When the British began to administer the country, they misunderstood the position of the Indian "landlord" in the body social, and converted him by enactments to the British type of landlord. The result of the imposition of this British type, in place of the orginal Indian, is thus well described: "Land, which was before merely a source of livelihood to the cultivator and of revenue to the State, has now become the subject of commercial speculation. The fixing of the revenue demand has conferred upon the owner a credit which he never before possessed, by allowing him a certain share of the unearned increment." This is exactly what modern Labour says. And yet the British author just quoted, after pointing out the artificial value put upon land, concludes with this placid and very British assertion:

"This credit he may use improvidently, but none the less has the land system of India been raised from a lower to a higher stage of civilisation." [!] It is this "higher stage" which is not only being condemned in the West to-day by all social reformers, but which is their main objective in the great campaign of amelioration. This "higher" stage is thus described in *The Imperial Gazetteer* of India: "Land which had formerly little or no market value has under the light assessments and the enforced peace of British rule acquired a value which renders it a transferable commodity, and in some parts of the country the land itself has passed largely, either by sale or by usufructuary mortgage, into the hands of the money-lending class." So the "enforced peace of British rule," and the enactments of the rulers, brought into India what had never before existed, that is, "landlordism". If the British Labour Party one of these days is going to help India to a better economic era, it will not be a "boon," but the repayment of a debt long overdue from England.

What the West is aiming at in this matter is what the East started with. For we find from immemorial times in India the conception that land is *not* an

object of commerce. Man can trade in the products of the land, but, in the past, greed of wealth never meant greed of land. "Give us strong sons and many cattle" is the reiterated old Vedic prayer, never "Give us land". It was not land which made a man wealthy or of consequence. It is very much to be doubted if even the Indian King himself ever really "owned" the land which he often gave as grants, and from which he derived his revenue; he was far more a trustee. So deep was the recognition that land was the basis of the people's prosperity that Manu enacted that, when a joint family divided, the pasture lands should *not* be divided, but should still be held in common. This old idea as to the inviolability of land was kept up in England under the feudal system; the King granted land to the barons, but they did not become its owners, in the modern sense. They drew revenue from the land, but only so long as military service was rendered to the King for it. While the land could descend from father to son, it could not be alienated, and it reverted to the King on the failure of male issue. It was when the feudal system broke down that the estates were broken up, and an opening was made to speculation in land.

Many are the schemes of taxation propounded in the West to free the toilers from land slavery, and to satisfy the natural "land hunger" of city dwellers who desire to escape from the power of the landlords in towns. Henry George's "single tax" is one of the best known. Each scheme has probably at least one true element to contribute to the final solution. Whether that solution will come soon or not depends largely on the position of British Labour. But it is evident that the solution will not be utterly new; it will be one which largely incorporates those original ideas about land with which the East started her civilisation, and which have not yet been forgotten, though her civilisation is being violently forced in this matter into a western mould.

When the land problem is put on its right basis, then, as Ruskin pointed out, we shall have the true Science of Economics, which thinks of the citizen not as a spender or as an earner, but first of all as a dweller in a home. Our professors of Political "Economy" will perhaps then be as much interested in municipal drains (or, more precisely, here in India, in the lack of them) as they are now in the "mechanism of exchange". For in Greek *polis* is a city, *oikos* a

house, and *nomos* a science. "The Science of Building Homes" was the great Science which Vaivasvata Manu of the Aryans gave His people when He sent them forth from their Central Asian home to colonise India and Europe. When the East and the West take up the problem of the land, they will but be taking up in a belated fashion the task which He placed before them long ago.

CHAPTER V

IN THE PROBLEM OF LABOUR

It is scarcely possible for those who have not lived in western lands to realise the vast upheaval which is now taking place in the very fabric of their social structure. We know that there are strikes and lock-outs, and that there are strongly organised parties for and against various economic reforms; we know too, a fact difficult to account for, that, in spite of their wealth, the nations of the West have a "submerged" population of the miserably poor, who are constantly on the verge of starvation.[1] Why should luxury and misery exist side by side, and vast wealth and direst poverty be neighbours, in such a typically western country as Britain?

Very largely because the wealth of many western nations is not a natural and indigenous form of wealth, but is a wealth derived from exploiting the

[1] This was written in February, 1921; it is officially reported that on June 10th there were in the United Kingdom 2,185,000 persons registered as unemployed.

nations of Asia and Africa. During the last century and a half, when the wealth of Britain has gone up by leaps and bounds, the wealth of the individual, as individual, has not kept pace. If the country, on the whole, is far richer per unit of population, it is largely because of the enormous wealth accumulated by a few. If such a paradox is possible, while the country grows rich, the people remain poor.

This anomalous situation is largely due to the introduction of machinery. The disorganisation in the elements of production due to factories brought about two distinct classes, which never existed before in such sharp contrast; these were the Capitalists and the Workers. Large fortunes were quickly amassed by the former by inducing Asia and Africa to buy products without which they had been content to live. The wealth acquired by British traders in Asia and Africa is enormous; if we read the list of wills probated in England each year, we can quickly see the sums accumulated by enterprising Colonial traders, and handed on to their descendants. Of course, this is by "fair" trade, if the word "fair" may cover transactions of two competitors, unequal as regards organisation and capital.

Now the general "development of trade," *i.e.*, largely the exploitation of Asia and Africa, did not distribute the wealth so acquired evenly over the population of western lands. It concentrated the wealth into the hands of a few. The original capitalists and merchants were undoubtedly hard-working, and—ethics apart—deserved the fruits of their labour. But from their accumulation of wealth arose a national evil, which was no less than the creation of an enjoying class in contrast to a productive class. The young men and women in thousands of British homes to-day, when succeeding to the fortunes of their hard-working grandparents, have no need to work; theirs is the rôle "in society," with hunting, shooting, racing, travel, and various necessitous forms of existence for "gilded youth". So ingrained is this evil in Britain, that it is "bad form" to talk about your work; it is more genteel to give the impression that you do not work, but are living on investments.

The rise of a spending class, which does not earn by work what it spends, lies at the root of the industrial and economic upheaval in western lands to-day. The workers, the toilers, have acquired enough education to see that, so long as they consent, their

lives must be spent hovering near the "hunger line". They are, therefore, determined no longer to tolerate the existing social order, which assures freedom to live on investments, without doing a single day's work. They are aiming at every man and woman being forced by law to work. "No work, no bread," was a principle once applied to the worker by the employer; the proletariat means to apply it now to the spending classes.

It is this element in Bolshevism which has made the workers of many countries so full of enthusiasm for it. Under the régime of the Tsars, there was a large spending class, which sat on the necks of the workers, and busied themselves only over the problem of how to enjoy themselves to the utmost. This class has been abolished in Russia, and "no work, no bread" has been applied to them. What remains of the spending classes is now a part of the working classes. The hatred of the Bolshevik for all that denoted the aristocrat has slain or driven from Russia some who had the finest culture, and who, for all their aristocracy, served their country nobly. Bolshevism is one end of the swing of a pendulum, and it cannot stay there. As a matter of

fact, it has not done so, and it has swung to the other end, for autocracy has returned to Russia in a new guise. But one achievement at least of Bolshevism is noteworthy, and that is the rule that none in a nation should be a spender without having been an earner.

The British Labour Party saw in time some of the fallacies of extremism, and it was a great step for Labour to recognise brain work as well as hand work. To-day, formally enrolled in the Labour Party, are some of the most brilliant thinkers of Britain, who work with voice and pen but not with hammer and plough. The word "Labour" is now beginning to signify in the minds of the workers a wider and truer thing than when modern Socialism began its gospel. It may be briefly said that all Labour, in all lands, is united on the doctrine of "no work, no bread".

It is a significant fact that, under the stress of a great national danger, many volunteered for work who had never before dreamed of such a probability for themselves. During the War, as slowly Britain's existence was more and more threatened, many were forced by their conscience to work in some way for the nation. Under the pressure of the abnormal

situation caused by the War, there arose for a while among the classes and the masses a fraternisation which none would have prophesied. It was then "good form" to work, and in a mystical way all who worked seemed to partake of a Brotherhood. It lasted only "for the duration of the War". Lately a picture in *Punch* depicted an old woman who is selling matches retorting sarcastically to a middle-class Briton, who disdained even to look at her wares: "Don't turn your 'ead away, my lord. Why, durin' the War it was all 'Ma, Ma, 'ave you any matches?'" During the War, many miracles happened; now that we have "peace," the day of miracles is over.

All the upheaval in western lands is tending in one direction—to the model Indian village. For there, as Vaivasvata Manu planned it, all are toilers and brothers, whatever may be their caste. In the village as He planned it, there are no wastrels; all are workers, all are spenders, and—*nota bene*—all are enjoyers. In the "professions," we have the priest, the schoolmaster, the physician, the poet, the musician, the magistrate; in the trades, we have all the craftsmen—carpenter, blacksmith, shoemaker, barber,

and so on. The village workers, from the highest to the lowest, insure the prosperity of the village by their toil, as their well-being was insured in turn by its wealth. This is exactly what all western nations are dreaming of. What has been achieved in India for ages for a village can be achieved for a nation. For what is a Nation but a large Village?

In India, all are workers and enjoyers in the village, because all are possessed by a common idea. It was just mentioned that in Britain, under the threat of a national calamity, men worked and became as brothers. That same unity of purpose was achieved in the Indian village, but not by the idea of danger. It was the idea of Duty, which kept as one living organism the clashing hopes and ambitions of the dwellers in the village. The priest toiled at his sacraments because it was his Dharma; so too did all, even the village scavenger. It is such a dominating idea as this that the West is seeking, and has not found. Patriotism will work wonders, but only for a while. The love of a Fatherland cannot, for most men, inspire the hourly sacrifices of self which are required in the model citizen. Patriotism by fits and starts will not make the model citizen.

Slowly the West is coming eastwards in its realisation that all must be workers; slowly the East will be able to accept the gift of machinery from the West, and not degrade herself in the doing. Machinery has come to stay; the "classes" are here to stay, since men are souls, and all souls are not of the same age; the workers are here to stay, reaching slowly to a happier day; and wealth is needed for all. But all must be driven by one Motive, one Will, as they seek happiness. That is found in the idea of Yajna, Sacrifice, which Manu gave to His peoples. Under many names this Idea reveals itself to men—as Dharma, Patriotism, Art, or Social Service. But the strength in them all is Sacrifice, that is, *making holy*.

CHAPTER VI

IN MEDICINE

At first sight there could not be a greater antithesis than the two types of healing represented by eastern and western medicine. The West says that a microbe is the cause of disease; the East very much doubts if there are any microbes at all! Yet one need but look through a microscope, and the microbe is before our eyes. The West says that Eastern systems of medicine have no scientific basis at all; and yet all the time millions are being cured by indigenous systems of medicine! So the dispute goes on, with misunderstandings and recriminations, bigotry on either side holding back the development of a great science.

But the two sides are being brought together, all unknown to each other. The march of the West towards the East in medicine is along several lines. It comes first along the line which states that in

disease there are not two sole factors, the germ and the patient, but three factors or partners—the germ, the patient, and a "third partner". Just as without the patient the germ is harmless, so is the germ harmless within the patient, if this "third partner" is absent. Now who may this new individual be? If the germ of tetanus or of gas gangrene be *washed* and then injected, it produces no effect, unless an ionisible salt of calcium gets in with the germ. "The third partner" is calcium salt. Rabbits will not be infected by the paratyphoid germ; but give them first ox-bile or some similar intestinal irritant, then the germ flourishes. The germ of phthisis or pulmonary consumption is harmless—most of us have it in us some part of the time in our lives—unless silica dust causes first an irritation in the membranes of the lungs. But vegetable dust does not cause such an irritation. Hence stone-cutters and printers are most liable to phthisis, but not engine-drivers.

In yet another way is Western medicine slowly turning away from the microbe to those conditions of the body's health which allow the germ to flourish. The subject of "vitamines," "hormones" and "chalones" is too intricate for popular exposition,

but roughly we have slowly arising the theory that a scientific diet is more than half the cure for disease. Drugs may indeed be efficacious, but they do not go to the first cause of disease, whereas diet does.

A more remarkable trend still is that which shows a psychic origin to certain maladies. It will come as a surprise to most that stuttering is due to a " psychic trauma," that is, to some kind of a shock to the imagination received when a child, and that it can be cured by the expert psychoanalyst. Some forms of rheumatism, it is found, are distinctly traceable to psychic causes, and Pfister is voicing the new theories when he says: " Many maladies are nothing else than flight from a severe ethical conflict, many others represent expiations for past shortcomings or counter-reactions to a burning feeling of shame."

So Western medicine is beginning to be subjective in its outlook, less emphasising the germ and more the germ's environment. Now this, of course, is the old theory. In the Indian systems of medicine, the body's health is considered as due to a fine adjustment of various " humours ". When a disease occurs, there is no attempt to kill the germ, but only to

restore an equilibrium which has been disturbed by the germ. The Western doctor gives quinine for malaria, to kill the germ; the Eastern doctor gives a concoction, not to kill the germ, but to restore the body's equilibrium, which necessarily involves the death of the germ. For some diseases, the "witch doctor" type of healer constructs an image of the patient, goes through incantations to convince the "disease devil" that the image is the patient, and induces the devil to go into the image, and so frees the sufferer from his infliction. But if instead of "obsession" we say "psychic trauma," if instead of "witch doctor" say "hypnotist" or "psychoanalyst," we shall be thoroughly up-to-date, as well as fashionable in our phrasing.

If the West is approaching the East in medicine, the East must, in turn, go towards the West. Since germs do exist and do cause damage, Asepsis, or the removal of the causes of infection, is an essential in healing. While the inner strength of the body is restored by the Indian method, the outer irritation too must be removed, if the healing is to be rapid. One day we shall perhaps abolish all drugs, both Eastern and Western. But we shall never abolish Asepsis.

Hygiene and sanitation, in other words, the prevention of infection by germs, must be heartily accepted by Eastern medicine. There must be intelligent and hearty co-operation given by Ayurvedic and Unani physicians to every attempt on the part of Western-trained doctors to control disease, by wiping out the breeding-places of germs in the home and in the town. Otherwise, with the best of Eastern systems, epidemics will ever be in our midst.

The day is surely not far distant when the East and the West will have joined hands, and there will then arise a science of healing truer than any that has yet been, a greater blessing to mankind than what it has been already.

CHAPTER VII

IN CLASS DISTINCTIONS

All the world knows of India as the land of caste divisions, and many in western lands suppose that, because of castes, India is a land of fratricidal hatreds. Existence of caste in India and an inability by Indians to combine and co-operate for a common welfare are considered inseparable by the critics of Indian civilisation. It never occurs to them that, since India has had caste for thousands of years, and since too during all that time India has developed a high civilisation, caste does not mean backwardness in culture. Furthermore, since in spite of twenty and more foreign invasions India has retained her cultural integrity for over twenty-three centuries, caste as an institution cannot be so very detrimental after all to a nation's growth. There is good in the caste idea, and there is evil in it; let us separate the two.

It is the true worth in the caste idea which makes caste or class divisions inevitable everywhere. These are the days of Democracy, when we proclaim the gospel of "I am as good as you—if not better". But somehow, to the careful observer of men and manners, the equality of "goodness" presumed in Democracy is not evident. Moreover, however much we may be democratic in *government*, we cannot eradicate the innate mental and emotional inequalities. In one form or another, mankind reverts to class or caste.

There are four clearly marked divisions in the Indian idea of caste. Men in a nation are of four fundamental types: 1. Teacher, 2. Warrior, 3. Merchant, and 4. Craftsman. The teacher includes in himself, in India, the capacity of priest; and the warrior is often the ruler and administrator also. Now, these four divisions are clearly marked in the history of the British People. Since the coming into England of feudalism, the "Government of England" consists of the King, the Lords Temporal and Spiritual, and the Commons. Under these phrases we have the four castes once again. The Kshattriya is represented by the King

and his temporal Barons; the Brahmana idea appears in the Spiritual Barons, the Bishops, and in all their followers, the Clergy, who alone were the teachers in mediæval England. The Vaishya is represented by the Burgesses, the merchants of the towns. The Shudra was the "Villein," the worker originally of the soil and tied to the soil. It is the burgesses and their dependents who make up the "Commons".

England has had many transformations and developments, but the four main types still remain unchanged. In England to-day, the powerful caste is that of the King, and of all who administer the State under him; these make up the nobility and the "gentry," and they provide the Army and Navy with officers, and the country with judges and administrators. A distinct and clearly marked profession is that of the "Church," the Brahmana of old; and the third or Vaishya caste is represented by the small merchants who are "in trade," as distinct from the large merchants and manufacturers of the cultured "upper middle classes," who "go to business" and yet can remain "gentlemen". The fourth caste is represented by the millions of the manual workers, now in Trade Unions, who are mechanics and labourers. The

divisions in England, when looked at by a stranger, are no more clear at first sight than here in India. An Aiyar, or a Charya, though a Brahmana, may in these days be found keeping a shop, which is a Vaishya's occupation, or as a chauffeur, which is a Shudra's profession. On the other hand, a man of the fourth caste, a Reddy, a Pillai or a Nair, in theory a workman, may be a great administrator or judge. In England, the son of an army officer may be a parson, or be "in business".

But, as here, caste or class at bottom is less an outer distinction, and more an inner one of aptitude of the soul, which responds to environment in clearly marked ways of behaviour and preference, affecting profoundly that indescribable quality called "taste," both as regards material and moral interests. A gentleman's son in England may have "low" preferences or tastes, or even be a "cad"; so too in India, caste in these days is no clear criterion of the true temperament or aptitude of a man. Yet, in spite of democracy, and of the fact that *political* power is coming more and more into the hands of the masses, class or caste distinctions do not tend to disappear.

How innate in human nature, and in national organisation, is class or caste division is shown by what is happening in Bolshevik Russia. At one sweep, all were made equal, when the Bolsheviks triumphed. The aristocrats and administrators were killed, or fled or hid themselves among the masses; the thinkers and creators in science, art and literature disappeared; the *bourgeoisie* was wiped out. All became "comrades," of one caste. But very quickly inequality appeared. The first new caste to spring up was that of the military and the administrators, who called the populace "comrades"—but ruled them. But the strangest phenomenon in Bolshevik Russia is the revival of the Brahmana class. These were the thinkers and teachers of the nation, the professors, artists and writers of Russia, who were unfit for any military or commercial career, and with the coming of Bolshevism were slowly beginning to die of starvation. By a curious set of circumstances, these have been collected together and housed in two institutions, the "House of Science" and the "House of Art and Literature," in Petrograd. They are now subsidised by the Bolsheviks, and given free allowance of food, and material for work. For the

4

wiser of the Bolshevik administrators saw in time that without the help of those who, by aptitude, were the thinkers of the nation, the people would not only stagnate, but would utterly go under in the stress of competition with other peoples. In one thing the Bolsheviks have succeeded, and that is in suppressing the merchant class in Russia. There are no shops, but only State-owned stores, where goods are distributed in return for tickets gained in State labour institutions. But it remains to be seen how long the Vaishya temperament and its energy for the development of a nation's resources can be kept suppressed by enactment. On the whole, one is inclined to agree with *Punch* on this matter, where lately a cartoon depicted a British extremist, armed with pick-axe and shovel, on the brink of a deep grave, thus conversing with a Bolshevist:

"What are you doing down there?"

Voice of Russian Bolshevist from below: "Digging a grave for the *bourgeoisie*."

British Extremist: "That's what I want to do; but how do you get out?"

Voice from below: "*You don't*."

So everywhere, even in ultra-democratic Russia to-day, we find the divisions of class or caste. Evidently therefore we are dealing with something fundamental in men. But these fundamental inner differences in men's natures need not create rivalries or frictions. On the other hand, when properly recognised, they make for a more harmonious life and activity in a nation. But the proper recognition consists not, as in India to-day, of mere family and ancestral heredity, but in the qualities which a man or woman shows in reacting to environment. It was the Lord Buddha who insisted that there were indeed Brahmanas, but a man was a Brahmana because of his thought and feeling and act, and not because of his family.

Humanity can never be levelled down by legal enactment to the lowest common measure of capacity or taste of the masses. Yet the fact that men in their inner nature are of a "higher" or "lower" class or caste need never mean the handicapping of a people. It is in the recognition, socially, though not politically, of the inevitable fact of class, that the East and the West have a common meeting-ground, in spite of all the experiments in statecraft

so common in the world to-day. So long as caste or class means special privilege or opportunity for self-expression, granted to a few only but not to all, caste is evil. But there cannot be anything evil in men of a temperament associating together for mutual benefit or convenience. On the contrary, a higher power of efficiency in the nation results when those of like temperament or taste join together for a common work, and all the diverse groups serve one purpose, that of a people's welfare. It has been well pointed out by Herbert Spencer that nature evolves from disorder to order, from chaos to cosmos, not by a series of like parts simply placed in juxtaposition, but by one whole made up of *unlike* parts, but *mutually dependent*.

There is, however, in India a fifth caste, clearly recognised, which is becoming slowly a great ideal in all western lands as well. In India, there exists the Sannyasi, of so high a "caste" indeed that to him all other castes are equal in this, that their caste means to him nothing at all. He is the man who sees all humanity as of one caste only, even that of the Sons of God. Class or caste distinctions vanish as he looks into the hearts of men, and sees there

one Divine Worker at work, who by turns is teacher and priest, warrior and administrator, merchant-prince and trader, and workman and server. But the day is distant when all men everywhere will be of this highest "caste" of the Sannyasi. Yet it is the ideal of the world, to which all peoples in western lands are striving to march under the banner of Brotherhood. Perhaps it is significant of the rôle which India is to play in the world's destinies that, before the world should know of its own need, the fulfilment of that need should have been planned for in India ages ago. For when the West asks: "How shall we rise above all castes and classes?" India can give the answer: "As the Sannyasi, the Renouncer."

CHAPTER VIII

IN THE RECOGNITION OF WOMAN

Usually in western lands, woman in the East is considered as a suppressed being, and as of little usefulness in the larger affairs of life. Because in some parts of India purdah exists, all Indian women are thought of as living in purdah. And, generally speaking, the prevalent idea in the West is that no higher or better condition of woman can be found anywhere than in the West itself. Now generalisations are most difficult when a bias enters into the thought; and probably no greater bias exists than that of nationality. The Englishman or the American, when considering the position of woman, picks out for generalisation only those elements in his civilisation which show it in its best aspects. It is the same with the Indian. Wherever a case has to be proved, accurate judgment becomes impossible. As a matter of fact, the highest conception of woman is exclusively

neither in the East nor in the West. Each has some essential elements to give to the ideal conception of Woman.

Where a nation still bears traces of a martial origin, woman is naturally enough considered the weaker, because at a crisis in the nation, as when an enemy attacks, she cannot bear arms and go out to meet the enemy. Out of this fact of physical inequality, there often arises the presumption of a moral inequality. Where a nation has long passed the stage of being militarily on the defensive, if inequality is attributed to woman, it is on other grounds. In eastern and western lands, there now exist two types of inequality, the legal and the social. In the main, there has been little legal inequality in the East, while it has persisted till quite lately in the West. In Hindu and specially in Muhammadan law, the woman has for long been the owner of property, and her right to ownership is not transferred to her husband on marriage. But in a typically western country like England, the right to own property by a married woman, as of her own, was only given in 1882. Till then, a married woman was practically a minor in all that concerned property. Many discriminations

against woman exist in all lands, but while it is custom which in India supports these disabilities, in the West custom is made hard and rigid by legal precedents and ėnactments. It was pointed out the other day by a Member of the Madras Government that, in the law of India as it stands, there is nothing to prevent a woman from becoming a Vakil.[1] Of course in England, there have been definite and legal obstacles against women becoming lawyers, which are now being removed by new laws.

The intensity of social inequality imposed on women has very largely depended on the stress of economic life. Where the man has met with keen competition as a home-maker and bread-winner, the woman has had to be a drudge in the home, finding little time or energy free to develop herself. As economic pressure lessened, the woman has had more freedom of self-expression. There has never been the question in India whether woman was the equal of the man or not; she was equal before the law, and equal in all spiritual matters, and hence the idea of equality or inequality has never arisen. The question has been: Did woman have the right opportunities to perform her Dharma

[1] A lawyer, entitled to plead in certain Courts of Justice.

or duty? Naturally, what is or is not a woman's Dharma depends upon the narrowness or largeness of mind and heart of the person who expounds the subject of woman's duty.

The awakening of women in the West has largely been due to the terrible economic pressure which many women workers have had to endure. They were suffering an injustice, and law needed to be changed to give them their just due. It is a tribute to the spirituality of womankind that the women, who toiled in the West to bring in the new era for women, were not those who suffered most from economic pressure, but their sisters of the well-to-do upper classes. In the East, the awakening of women is largely due to a keen desire to associate themselves with men in a common National work. On some fundamental observances of Hindu worship, already the woman is as necessary as the man; certain religious sacraments of Hinduism cannot be performed unless the wife is present with the husband.

The emancipation of woman from those customs and laws which have crippled her self-expression has not done one thing which was prophesied by all its opponents, that is, to make her less woman. It is

true that here and there, in the beginning of a new era, it is as if a pendulum swung to the opposite extreme, and so excesses occur which go beyond a median line of what is good and wholesome. But this is temporary, and the mannish woman is a rare freak and by-product, and not the normal product. To one mannish woman produced by woman's emancipation, there are a hundred thousand normal women, who have revealed new attributes of womanhood. It is this new revelation of the Eternal Feminine *pari passu* with the emancipation of woman that is one of the most fascinating psychological problems in life. In a country like England, there was a time, which is now known as "mid-Victorian," when it was "lady-like" to faint, and very un-lady-like to ride alone in a hansom cab or on the top of an omnibus. But to-day, the modern athletic English girl could not faint if she tried, and she drives her motor cycle. But these new accomplishments of the emancipated woman have not diminished in the least her fascination as a woman. Quite on the contrary, she has in her new attributes of femininity which were lacking in the mid-Victorian "lady-like" young woman. It is as if, in releasing woman from the fetters of

ignorance and limitation which cramped her, a hidden womanhood were being revealed. As with greater sunshine and rain more germs buried in the soil spring up, so it is with woman's nature. The freer her soul is in its manifestations, the more wonderful are her revelations of a Divine Womanhood. This is the experience of all thoughtful observers in the West of the era of woman's emancipation, which has dawned for the West in one land after another.

What the West is slowly beginning to discover about woman, the East has always known, however hitherto she has failed to put it into practice. Not even in ancient Greece, where there existed a Goddess of Beauty, was there ever such a high recognition of the Eternal Feminine as in the Hindu religion. Hinduism says boldly that God is not Man only but Woman also. This duality of the Godhead, which is so striking to the Western mind, is perfectly matter-of-fact to the Indian. The God and His Shakti are inseparable. As Divinity rules, so Beauty must pervade. Each triune aspect of the Godhead has His Shakti or Power, which manifests as a Divine Woman. By the side of Shiva is His consort Parvatī, by Vishnu's side is Lakshmī, and Brahmā

has as consort Sarasvatī. The consort of the God is not the "weaker vessel"; on the contrary, she is the embodiment of His *Power*. There is no tradition in India that woman is "frail"; rather, on the part of the men, a resentment that she possesses powers which they cannot thwart. It is the frailty of man, before the onslaught of woman, that is lamented as man's tragedy.

Life is a revelation not of God alone, but of God-Goddess. What does this mean except that there is no limit to the self-revelation of woman? As man now, through his specialised modes of manly actions, dreams of a nobler era when all men shall be more God-like, so too, as woman through her new training lives in a freer world, all women will become more Goddess-like. In other words, since creation is not a blunder nor a fortuitous concourse of atoms, life is the process of men becoming more God-like and women growing more Goddess-like, in the image of God's Shakti.

There lies but one step further in the conception of woman, as too of man. That is to achieve that lofty vision of our ancient Fathers, who saw behind loftiest manhood and loveliest womanhood but One

Entity. "Thou woman dost become, and man, and youth, maid too in sooth . . . Thou takest birth with face on every side." This was the vision of the Rishi Shvetāshvatara of that One Existence which enfolds all existent beings within it. If it is true that "Thou woman dost become," then surely in the woman's becoming more capable, more learned and wise, not mother alone of one family but the Mother-Spirit of a whole Nation, in her treading side by side with man the path that Life calls on her to tread—as teacher, as statesman, as ruler, what matters?—surely then the Divine Will must be more fulfilled. As woman thus uses her Shakti, that power now hidden in her, surely there will be a greater realisation by man of his Divinity. Of what else did the ancient Sages sing, but of this wonderful Fact? It is that Fact of facts which the West is now discovering for the first time. But the East knew it, ah, such long ages ago.

CHAPTER IX

IN PRACTICAL RELIGION

There is in us all a natural tendency to glorify the past at the expense of the present. "The good old days" have roseate hues which our eyes do not see in the drab present. Old people especially are never tired of drawing invidious distinctions between what was and what is. On one matter, the older generations both in the East and West are agreed, and that is, that there was more true religion and real piety when they were young than is to be found to-day.

If this were really the case, the world would be in a bad way; in reality, there was probably never a time when the world was so full of reformers and idealists. What is really happening is a remarkable world-wide change which is taking place in the conception of religion. In the past, to be "religious" meant to subscribe to ancient and accepted formulæ of observances. The day's work had to be consecrated at its

beginning with certain prayers and worship; an outer and visible routine was inseparable from true piety. Undoubtedly, in the lives of men and women in the East and the West to-day, a religious routine is tending to weaken, and in many cases no longer exists at all. But this does not mean that men's spiritual convictions are lessening. On the contrary, they are probably as sound now as at any other time. But the routine is changing from one of formulæ and ceremonies to one of idealistic and philanthropic action.

The contrast in this matter between the past and the present could not be better illustrated than by two types of Sannyasis, the one following the old routine, the other the new. The Sannyasis of the old type are everywhere in India; they are clearly distinguishable by outer garb from "worldly" men. They have renounced the world's glamour, and they find no useful action possible in moulding its "unspiritual" ways. They draw a hard and fast line between this world of daily bread and another world of spiritual realisation.

The modern Sannyasi, in the West as in the East, wears the garb of ordinary men, mingles with them

as one of themselves, and yet inwardly is the renouncer. One of the best examples of the modern Sannyasi is the present head of the Servants of India Society, Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. Each member of that Society on joining it renounces his prospects of worldly advancement, and dedicates himself to the welfare of the country. A similar society is the Order of the Brothers of Service, of Adyar, Madras, the members of which renounce their worldly prospects to dedicate themselves to philanthropic work under the guidance of a Head, who is called the Brother Server. Hundreds of men and women in organisations in the West are so pledged to renounce a "worldly career," in order to give the best of themselves to a work.

Now all these men and women are not consecrated priests of any ritual or cult; they claim no special spiritual gifts which others do not have. They move in the world, and they are aiming to spiritualise the world's activities not from the hermitage but from the market-place. Their piety consists not in prayers and penances, but in a dedication to efficiency in a chosen line of work. The mark of their spirituality is not visible to men's eyes; it is a spirit of renunciation

and service in the heart. They can sit at the council boards of kings with a clean heart, which desires nothing for themselves;[1] they can live as others do, yet not have personal ambitions.

This ideal of religion is gaining ground steadily both in the East and West. The old formularies of religion are for many nothing more than words and gestures; they do not find the spiritual gleam in the fog of prayers and hymns. Some of these modern Sannyasis go to the length of having no "creed" at all, except always to forget themselves in a work for others. Many of them have little faith in a life to come, and their idealism is satisfied with a future of annihilation of their personal selves.

It is this formless, non-ritualistic dedication to altruism which our elders do not understand, and which orthodoxies look upon as a phase of irreligion. But it is the way the modern world is going. While temples and churches still have their crowds of followers, there are fewer and fewer among them of the keenly intellectual, of the self-sacrificing and the daring. In this world to-day of clash and turmoil,

[1] Mr. Srinivasa Sastri is one of India's representatives at the Imperial Conference, meeting in London.

there are some souls who want to go out into the battle and the storm, and in fighting for man to find the God of their dreams. Fewer and fewer of these are the worshippers in temples and churches.

It is these modern Sannyasis who are adding to the rich treasure of religion new germs of realisation. They are the gospellers of a religion of Work, the apostles of a God who is a Worker. With their spirit of renunciation, they bring to-day into our lives a purification which, alas, we no longer get from priests and recluses. They are Karma-Yogins, cultivating both Jñāna and Bhakti, Wisdom and Devotion, in order to make their actions more harmonious with Divine Action. Wherever a true Karma-Yogin of the East meets one of the West, or *vice versa*, they meet as brothers, as seekers who have solved some at least of the great mysteries of life, and who have something precious to give to their fellow men because they themselves have renounced all. The increasing number of these men and women of Practical Religion is bringing about great changes in all religions. They are revealing the fact that Reality is not static but dynamic, not a Quiescence but an ever-transforming Motion. They

show that prayers and ceremonies are useful, but only up to a point; that point is where a man ceases to ask of life nothing more than the privilege to work.

This significant world-wide movement for Action as the test of spiritual conviction is, of course, the ancient gospel of the *Bhagavad Gita* in a modern setting. The ancient Kurukshetra has transformed itself; the battle-field is to-day the council chamber, the conference platform, the school, the slum, the factory and the hospital; the opposing hosts are the children of darkness, who are afraid of change and worship a God-of-things-as-they-are, and will have naught to do with a God-of-things-as-they-should-be. But now the Charioteer is an Inner Ruler within the heart of man and woman, whose voice is not less sure or less commanding because He is unseen. The world has not changed—except for the better. Perhaps the good old days had more of an outer light; but the inner light is glowing in a larger number to-day. Where that light shines, there is no East nor West. The fact of that light shining so brightly in thousands in the East and in the West is one of the inspiring signs that a day will come when there will be neither East nor West, but only one world.

CHAPTER X

IN THE CULT OF BEAUTY

Two great forces by turns work upon the world, as by an unseen direction the destinies of peoples are fashioned to shape civilisation. One force drives nations apart, and the other draws them together. Centrifugal and centripetal energies seem as the ebb and flow of a hidden tide in the affairs of men, and now the ebb and now the flow is visible as we study the history of nations. Rivalries and jealousies, and wars in their train, make for a while civilisation a mere mockery; then, as the world's wheel turns, a new era dawns, and the erstwhile enemies look at each other with new eyes, and see that the enemy of yesterday is a fellow man after all.

The centripetal forces in the world are slowly gaining strength, with set-backs here and there, it is true. But the voice of Nature, which whispers to the mystic's ear "I am one," is being heard to-day by myriads. There is in men's hearts to-day, whether they be of

the East or of the West, a craving to justify to the mind a faith that is slowly being born in the heart. That faith is that there is a lovelier life and nobler aims than a man can find within the boundaries of one land, however passionately he may love that land as "God's country". It is this new spirit among men that makes the meeting of the East and the West not a beautiful dream, but a reality which is slowly being discovered by those men and women who are in the vanguard of civilisation.

Among all the factors which to-day are binding the East and the West in the bonds of understanding and help, perhaps the two strongest are the Creed of Brotherhood and the Gospel of Beauty. It is the former which is becoming a universal religion, and is now professed by the best in all the existing religions. For those who truly live their faith, not with outer observances of conch or bell, of pranāms or genuflections, but humbly and inwardly, with charity and consecration, know that there can be but one Truth in the world, as there is but one Sun to dispel the night's darkness. The Creed of Brotherhood meets no opponents to-day; few there be indeed who live it, but none who challenge it as an ideal. The very

exploitation of the industrially ill-equipped Eastern peoples by the "hustling" West makes to stand out all the more clearly in contrast the dreams which the philanthropic men and women of the West have of a comity of all nations who shall help and sustain each other, without the present international bickerings. The "colour bar" to-day in the White Dominions of the Empire only emphasises the aims of the best Imperialists in those very Dominions and in Britain to create a true Imperial Home, where men of East and West, and North and South, shall live side by side, under equal privileges as with equal obligations, to serve one Divine purpose for the Empire. All the forces of darkness which deny Brotherhood call out even stronger forces determined to realise it. The final victory is with Brotherhood, and not with enmity and isolation, though there is bound to be yet many a skirmish between the advance guard of the one and the rearguard of the other.

Of equal consequence just now as the Creed of Brotherhood, for uniting the East and the West, is the Gospel of Beauty. In the cult of the Beautiful, humanity has found a golden chain which binds people to people, and continent to continent. In

painting and sculpture, in architecture and music, in literature and drama, men and women of the whole world hear one universal language spoken by the creative imagination of Man. Art has no Fatherland, except it be that of the highest human Spirit, which is the mirror of the Spirit of God. As we read a poem from France or Italy, from England or Germany, from India or Japan, no thought of nationality enters the imagination to warp the pure reflection there of the Good, the True and the Beautiful. Time ceases when Beauty reveals herself, and a hymn of the Veda or an episode of Homer is as alive to-day as the creation of the most modern poet. Who can explain why Art transcends nationality, and is "not for an age but for all time"? While German submarines sank non-combatant ships and murdered innocent men and women, the classical music of Germany was being played in London, for the art-lovers of Britain had realised that the best of Germany, her music, was for all nations, and the mud and slime of German frightfulness could not soil or stain the House of Art which the best of Germany had fashioned once upon a time. Tagore's imagination creates in Bengali, and it is clothed in English, and clothed again in French or

Dutch or Scandinavian, and yet the brooding spirit of India is revealed through all the translations, and the West hails the poet of the East as a world-poet, whose message is for all who seek the Spirit of Goodness and Beauty. Shakespeare is acted in all the tongues of India, and men see in his creations not Elizabethans but themselves, living and loving and toiling in Indian villages under Indian skies.

This need of Beauty is being felt more and more by the best of humanity to-day. And so feeling, they are being forced in their search to seek her not only in their Motherland but in foreign lands as well. No more significant fact is there just now than the avidity with which all branches of Eastern Art are being sought after in the West to-day. Art-lovers of the West know that they miss in their Cult of Beauty something which the East has realised; such few Eastern artists as have studied in the West know that there is in Western Art what is not to be found in the Art of India, Japan or China. There is no rivalry or jealousy in the love of Beauty; all aspects of Beauty are equal, for all reflect a world which is beyond time and space and mortality, and to which the Spirit of man is most inwardly kin.

While Patriotism divides, Art unites. Each work of art from Benares or Surat or Moradabad, as it goes to western lands, carries with it a whisper that Indian hearts are dreaming of a Beauty which is unchanging, and which is the solace in a world of impermanence and decay. Each in western lands who gazes on the creations of the Indian imagination, thrills to know that his own dream of immortality and permanence is known by brother dreamers in far-off India. By poem and by picture, minds are being trained to know a Unity which transcends the dividing lines of colour and creed. And as further a man travels, and sees for himself the glorious sights which nature reveals in the many lands of the world, his heart transcends the barriers which a national tradition imposes upon his imagination. The steady growth of a sense of Beauty in life is the surest promise that Brotherhood will in no long time cease to be a dream, and will be a reality of our daily lives.

It is striking to note how the ideal of Brotherhood and a love of the Beautiful react on each other in our lives to-day. Sympathy with man and sympathy with nature seem like substance and shadow, one being the substance to some souls, while to others it

is only the shadow. But shadow and substance both reveal to the imagination possibilities of thought and feeling, for the nation as for the individual, of which we scarce dream to-day. Our world now cannot conceive of life where there shall be no competition, no prejudice of caste or class or colour, and no narrowing pride of race and tradition. Yet that such a world exists somewhere, is ever the message of both Brotherhood and Beauty.

They are the compelling factors of the new world in the making. Even if as yet only a few consecrate themselves to the New Humanity which is coming, those few are slowly gaining in strength, for to the soul who is strong enough to say that there is no East and no West, but only one Humanity, all Nature's forces give aid to-day to dare and to achieve. The East and the West must perforce come together, for their separation henceforth is an illusion, a Māyā, a thing of time and limitation. And when the Māyā lifts, then the two are seen to be one, neither East nor West, but only one wonderful, indescribable Life. This vision out of time and space and illusion is ever his who will seek neither East nor West, neither North nor South, but only the Centre.

THE VALUE OF THE INDIAN TEMPERAMENT TO CIVILISATION[1]

NOT so long ago many people would have asked: "Is there an Indian temperament which is of any value?" But now, since the writings of Tagore have become known, people who are at all cultured have begun to realise that there is distinctly an Indian temperament. But that realisation is only recent. Not so many generations ago, when Kinglake wrote *Eothen*, he voiced the general attitude towards the Oriental, and considered him as having no special value to the changing activities of Western life, in these words:

> A mere Oriental, who, for creative purposes, is a thing dead and dry, a mental mummy that may have been a live king just after the Flood, but has since lain embalmed in spice.

It is that idea, that the Oriental is dead and dry, a beautiful thing to contemplate when embalmed in spice and put on a pedestal in forms of Oriental art,

[1] An address delivered to the *Britain and India* Conference, Mortimer Hall, London, October, 1920.

that is so very greatly the conception of many people. It is not, as I have mentioned, the conception of really cultured people.

Now, the Oriental, especially that branch which we find in India, has indeed a very strong temperament. Otherwise, would the civilisation which exists in India have persisted for so many centuries? With the exception of China, there is no other great people which has had a civilisation that has persisted so long with practically no change. In the days of Greece and Rome, Indian civilisation was in the main what it is to-day. India has shown an unusual capacity, not only to resist elements inimical to herself, but also to assimilate the characteristics of the civilisations of her many invaders. They tell us that within historic times there have been something like twenty distinct invasions of India by foreign peoples. Every one of these invasions has lost itself in the sands of Indian soil, and the invaders have become assimilated with the Indian people. In other words, so strong is the Indian temperament that, however alien in some ways may be the characteristics of foreign civilisations, in the end each foreign civilisation is assimilated.

I think we shall find that this psychological capacity of India to absorb what comes from outside, lies at the root of many difficulties which exist between the people of Britain and the people of India. For when a Briton goes to India, he feels subconsciously, so strong is the mental and social atmosphere around him, that, unless he rigidly entrenches himself behind his own special type of civilisation, he will lose some of its characteristics. When the Arabs came, they were quickly absorbed into Indian civilisation, and to-day the Mussalman is an integral part of Indian national life. In exactly the same way, it is not at all unlikely that most, if not all, Britons who go to India will, if they remain, become less aggressively English and, ultimately, be absorbed into Indian civilisation. It is this fear, that the Briton will lose his specifically British characteristics, which stands at the root of the race difficulty between the two peoples. For India has a dominating temperament, stronger, because more subtle, than the British.

Now, India is assimilating vigorously everything of science to-day. People imagine that the Indian temperament is something philosophic, full of abstraction

and dreaminess. It is all that; but I want you to note, if you watch India to-day, that in spite of that subjective quality of temperament, there is sufficient objective capacity to bring out of the Indian people not only scientists, mathematicians and politicians, but also commercial magnates. The Indian will soon compete in everything with the rest of the world, but he will always have the specific characteristics of his nation.

When we think of India, we little realise how vast is the territory covered, and how multitudinous are its activities, and how many types of character there are in India. Let me read you a little extract from an Indian writer, who describes the different temperaments to be found in India, as these temperaments react to the modern idea of progress:

> The word of progress that was hailed with delight by the sturdy Panjabi in the land of the five rivers, by the intellectual inhabitants of the valley of the Ganges, by the sensitive, emotional, highly-refined patriot of Bengal, by the cool, common sense of the Madrasi, by the astute Mahratta, by the calculating Guzerati.

All these characteristics we find in the various Provinces of India, and yet, different though they are, they have a certain common aspect, and it

is this common aspect which I call the Indian temperament.

I think perhaps the best way to illustrate the Indian temperament is by taking one of the most vital topics of to-day, and showing you how you will see it discussed in India. The topic that you will hear all over the world to-day is democracy. It is in the air; it is spread in all forms. What is your Western conception of democracy, which you will find here in Britain, or France, or America? It is that the individual is a citizen, and as a citizen of this earthly State, he has certain rights. In other words, if you read all that is written about democracy, you will find throughout the conception that the individual is a unit in the City of Man. But immediately the problem is approached from the Indian temperament, you have a different vision. Take, for instance, the attitude towards democracy of the Mussalmans of India. Why does the Mussalman believe in democracy? Because he has known of it from infancy. The democratic idea is the heart and root of Muhammadanism, and in the great teachings which the Prophet of Islam gave, he ushered in with a clear vision and on a broad base of political

and social work the idea of democracy. The idea of democracy appeals to the Muhammadans because each thinks of himself as a citizen in the City of God, for the individual Muhammadan sees equality between himself and all other fellow Muhammadans, since all partake of the citizenship, not of an earthly State, but of one heavenly. There is, therefore, a mystical idea of democracy in India, quite distinct from the external belief about it in the West.

Then, there is the attitude of the Hindu to democracy. The conception of democracy, as ensouled in Western political forms, is nothing more than what is in his immemorial tradition, and in a profounder way than it is given to Western nations to imagine. For the cultured Indian tries to realise in his religion that in all men, irrespective of caste distinctions, there is the one great mystery of God. The Divine Nature as immanent in all men, in all orders of creation, is the heart and soul of Hindu beliefs; and, basing himself on that doctrine, the Indian surveys the question of democracy.

When, then, you look on the Mussalman attitude and the Hindu attitude to the problem of democracy, you find that it is quite a new way of looking at the

problem. I want, in talking of the Indian temperament, especially to emphasise that, because it is so typical of the temperament. The Indian temperament likes to proceed from a great idea; it tries to grasp first a principle, and then to apply the principle in practice. That is quite the reverse of what you find in Britain. Ideas as such are not popular in Britain; but action is distinctly liked. If a course of action proves itself workable, as satisfactory for the time, say, of one generation, that action is accepted. Now the very striking British attitude to political change, for instance, is exemplified in some remarks of Thackeray in *Esmond*, where he describes in many ways the typical Briton. Thackeray is thinking of the course of constitutional development in England, especially at the time when the Stuarts were expelled, and foreign Kings were imported to rule in their stead:

A strange series of compromises is that English History; compromise of principle, compromise of party, compromise of worship! The lovers of English freedom and independence submitted their religious consciences to an Act of Parliament; could not consolidate their liberty without sending to Zell or the Hague for a king to live under, and could not find among the proudest people in the world a man speaking their own language,

and understanding their laws to govern them. In England you can but belong to one party or t'other, and you take the house you live in with all its encumbrances, its retainers, its antique discomforts, and ruins even; you patch up but you never build anew.

It is absolutely different in India. The Indian works with the idea; he must see the idea clearly, and if in his mind there is any vagueness in the idea, the application of it is not easy for him. And that is just the trouble to-day with the present Reforms, the reason for all the difficulties and discussions. They are due to the fact that the Indian sees in the Reform Bill all kinds of functions which are not clearly conceived. The Englishman does not care if they are not clearly conceived, so long as they "work," for the period, say, of his generation. Other generations will have to look after their own troubles! It is to this the Indian particularly objects. It is one of the most striking characteristics of the Indian temperament, that it tries to see clearly into everything, before it plunges into action.

Now, it is quite true that in applying what he sees the Indian may fail in application, where the Briton will be successful. For you cannot always see clearly

into everything, before acting. I am not here to say that any one temperament is better than another; I want to point out that there is distinctly a characteristic temperament which may be called Indian. The Indian, in other words, is "subjective". He certainly can see things from the standpoint of the outer world of action, with the vision of one utterly immersed in it; but he prefers to act from inner and fundamental principles.

The usual conception of life, as it is lived in the West, is well summed up in these words of Herbert Spencer:

> The progress of mankind is, under one aspect, a means of liberating more and more life from mere toil and leaving more and more life available for relaxation —for pleasurable culture, for æsthetic culture, for gratification, for travel, for games.

All the time, then, if there is anything left over from the struggle for bread and butter, it is for relaxation. There is no idea that, if you have any leisure, you might as well try to *understand life*. That is the Indian attitude. The Indian too wants leisure; he engages in business, he tries to make a fortune, but all the time he feels that life is not

for an æsthetic gratification through travel or games, but for a discovery which will bring him to the centre of things. Subconsciously all the time, the Indian temperament is trying to come to the centre, for unless the problem of life is seen fully and clearly, a satisfactory life is not possible for him. Hence the Indian temperament, which expresses itself in its typical forms of drama, literature, philosophy, and now to-day in political action.

You cannot separate the Indian temperament from the deepest quality of religion. It is impossible to have any kind of truly popular political meeting in India unless you have the religious element in the beginning. Everybody stands for fifteen minutes while Bande Mataram, the national song, is sung in Sanskrit. It may seem to you long, a bit tiresome and dreary; yet it appeals to the Indian, because it strikes a deep mystical, religious note.

Hail, Mother, we bow to thee!
Nature supplies thee with all thy wants,
With sweet water and with luscious fruits.
Thou art soothed by balmy breeze,
Ever verdant with green herbage;
Thy nights resplendent with silver moons,
Bedecked thou art in flowery plants,
Ever cheerful, ever bright,

Full of promise and of hope;
Mother, thou bestoweth
Sweet pleasure and happiness divine.
Thy cause championed by thirty crores of souls,
Twice thirty crores of arms to defend thee:
Who says, Mother, thou art feeble?
Thou commandest immense strength,
Our salvation lies in thee:
Hail, Mother, we bow to thee!
Thou hast power to ward off foes,
Mother, we bow to thee.
Ever happy and ever simple,
Ever bright and ever beautiful,
Thou our support, our nourishment,
We bow to thee.

After this striking hymn to Mother India, you may have violent speeches of an inflammatory nature; but you must consecrate your beginning with religion. At the beginning of an address, there is no "Ladies and Gentlemen," as in the West. When beginning his address, the Indian always uses the words, "Brothers and Sisters". Mussalman and Hindu, high class or low caste, are, even as the public, "Brothers and Sisters".

The Indian temperament, whether it is in the Hindu or the Mussalman, is well described in a mystical phrase which is typical of the highest forms of Indian mysticism. It is the prayer in the heart of

every Hindu: "From the unreal lead me to the Real, from darkness lead me to Light, from death lead me to Immortality." All life is seen as unreal; all the activities in which one is immersed are not real; they are only, as it were, shadows cast by the great Reality. All your highest mysticism has the same message, in a slightly different form; with you it is the fundamental doctrine of obedience to God's will, the attitude of the soul which tries to see in what happens the working out of a great Will to which man must subordinate himself. "Thy Will be done" is a belief in the inmost nature of the individual, because he feels that what is manifested in forms of activity in the outer world are realisations of that which is planned in the inner world. While in the West you try to get to Reality from the outer world, by excelling in the outer, the Indian tries to gain Reality by retreating within, by becoming master in his inner world.

This theme would require many an hour fully to describe, but it can be summed up by saying that the Indian looks at things not for what they *are*, but for what they *may be*. That is why the Indian is not understood by the Englishman, and why the Indian

does not understand the Englishman. It is exactly the problem you have in Ireland. India might easily develop into a second Ireland. In Ireland, a peasant lives in a primitive hut with his pig and poultry, and then the Englishman comes along and builds a model cottage for him; but the Irishman soon moves out of the model cottage, into where he was first, with his pig and his chickens running in and out and living in the same room with him. Why? Because he is not thinking of mere outer convenience, and so he does not value what has been done for him. He is thinking of his "atmosphere," and the sensations evoked by it. He would much rather have things as they are, than live in model dwellings with no inner atmosphere. There is no question that to the Irishman there are things of more value than mere outer comforts. It is exactly the same in India. It is not that the Indian is ungrateful for sanitary and other reforms, for railways and all kinds of things which you consider as the priceless gift of British Rule. It is not that he is unreasonable, unsympathetic towards external things, and lacks proper gratitude. But these are not the things which make for real

vividness in life; those are the things of the subjective world.

The Indian must have first certain great ideas; he must make the inner world of himself clear to himself, before he can go forth and act. Of the civilisations in the West to-day which emphasise the value of thought first, before action, the French are foremost. With the French, lucidity of thought gives a new insight to life. The French care for clear thought, and they try to come to an intellectual centre with regard to the problems of life. Now, it is not a mere intellectual centre, but a spiritual, which the Indian wants to realise, for life here below has to him some kind of a relation to the greater life of the Cosmos. Nothing is for him right unless he can fit his life into that great purpose. Hence the Indian temperament consciously or unconsciously seeks the centre. It tries to realise what Milton says: "He that has light within his own clear breast may sit i' th' centre and enjoy bright day." Not merely to enjoy the Light, but also to get from it to the Centre, is characteristic of the Indian temperament. He must seek always God, Perfection, behind the outer veil of things. And when in the days to

come, the cultured Englishman and the cultured Indian stand side by side, the temperament of action united to the temperament of thought, then we shall see the soul-temperament of God.

SUBJECTIVE AND OBJECTIVE NATIONALISM

It is often remarked that there never can be any true national feeling in India because there are so many languages in India. Since, in Europe, the sense of Nationality has gone hand in hand with a common language, people take for granted that everywhere the two must be co-existent.

Certainly India has not a common language. But, nevertheless, Indians—especially the Hindu division of the people—have had for thousands of years a national sense and a national unity. But it is a type of nationality which finds no parallel in Europe.

When we talk of a "nation," at bottom we mean a national culture. This culture is the combined result of language, religion, social customs, prides, ambitions, and fears. Nationality is the result both of internal forces originating within a people themselves, and of external forces converging on them from outside. Of the two, the essential element is the first; without an inner cohesion, no mere pressure of

external circumstance will make scattered towns and cities into a nation. This much is generally recognised; but what is not recognised is that, covered by the word "nationality," there are two psychological elements, one subjective, and the other objective. The objective expression of nationality is a common language, a central government and an army for defence and offence.

It is largely this objective expression which Western writers have in mind, when they speak of a nation. But there is a subtle subjective element in nationality, which, as a matter of fact, is far more essential an expression than the objective. For several generations the Poles have had no objective nationality; yet their subjective nationality persisted, till the League of Nations created a new Poland. The Jewish people have no objective nationality; they have not had for centuries a common government, nor even a common dwelling-place; yet their subjective nationality has always been recognised, and now, in the Zionist movement, it is ready to find an objective expression in a territory and a government.

India to-day is hoping for an objective expression to its nationality, as a self-governing Dominion. But

this aim is realisable only because there has been for thousands of years a subjective nationality. The elements which have gone to make up this hidden nationality are: (1) a common worship; (2) a set of mental images common to all, expressed sometimes through a common language and sometimes through different dialects; (3) the thought of a common homeland of culture.

(1) *A Common Worship.*—To a religious people like the Hindus, the Divine in the Universe is inseparable from all expressions of activity in that universe. Just as, in the West to-day, the phenomena of the universe are thought of as "natural" phenomena, a revelation of Nature's forces, so in India those same phenomena have ever been thought of as Divine phenomena, the revelation of a Divine Life. Starting from this postulate, Hindu thought has diverged into many streams and channels through thousands of years, but there is a quality common to them all. From the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, Brahmā, Vishnu and Shiva and their Consorts are the great Gods. The hundreds of minor Gods and local "godlings" everywhere in India are but revelations of those great Gods. Wherever there is a

"local God," even though his worship is restricted to a small locality, a cultured Hindu can at once with a little inquiry "place" the godling in the Trinitarian Hierarchy of a common Hinduism. Furthermore, among the members of the four great castes, there are the same religious observances throughout India. I do not mean that there are no differences at all, but that no great differences exist in the *fundamental* religious observances. The ceremonies at birth, at "second birth," for marriage, for death and mourning, are the same in the main throughout all India, because they are based on a common worship. The prayers are the same, the consecrations are the same; even if a man of the extreme South cannot understand the spoken language at Hardwar in the North, he knows the *meaning* of the priest's mutterings and gestures there. It is exactly the same for the man who comes from Kutch in the farthest West to Rāmeshwaram in the farthest South, to perform, say a *shrāddha* or funeral rite; the priest whom he employs is Tamil, but he understands what the priest does in his ceremonies.

(2) *Common Mental Images.*—Any traveller who has really travelled in India—not merely seen sights,

but who has got to know Indians as they really think and feel—will be astonished at the similarities of ways of thought and feeling throughout the length and breadth of India, in spite of different dialects and languages. This is partly due to the fact that the Hindus are descendants of foreign settlers who came to India from over the Himalayas. As happens in such cases, the settlers when they scattered clung tenaciously to their characteristic ways of thought and feeling. To-day, to the European foreigner, the Britisher from Yorkshire or Canada or Australia is still "English," because all three, though living oceans apart, vividly live in a common set of mental images. In a similar fashion, though the British colonial settlements are scarcely a century old, and the Hindu settlements in India are thousands of years old, yet, wherever there are the descendants of the original Indian settlers, they have common mental images still. So strong was the original Aryan culture of the settlers, that they have imposed it throughout all India, even though numerically they were few in certain parts of the country. Ātman, Reincarnation, Karma, Yoga, Renunciation, Dāna or Charity, Dharma or Duty, these give the same direction to thought in the

North as in the South, in the West as in the East of India. Talk where you will and to whom you will, high caste or outcaste, of these fundamental ideas, you will at once be understood. No truer thing was said about the Indian peasant than these words of Sir Herbert Risley in *The People of India*:

> These ideas are not the monopoly of the learned: they are shared in great measure by the man in the street. If you talk to a fairly intelligent Hindu peasant about the paramātma, karma, māyā, mukti, and so forth, you will find, as soon as he has got over his surprise at your interest in such matters, that the terms are familiar to him, and that he has formed a rough working theory of their bearing upon his own future.

In addition to this common substratum of thought, there is another set of mental images common to all Hindus throughout India. These are the great heroes who have crystallised India's dreams of nobility. Whatever is the dialect spoken, Rāma, Sītā, Lakshman, Rāvana, Sāvitrī, Bhīma, Arjuna, Bhīshma, Krishna, are the same in all the tongues, and evoke the same ideas of righteousness, truth, duty, devotion, valour, sacrifice, etc. For two thousand years at least, the popular dramas have been the same all over India; the vast epic story of early Indian heroes is known

everywhere. Whether in Tinnevelly in the South or in Amritsar in the North, if King Rāma appears accompanied by another younger than he, the people know that the latter is Lakshman, and they know that Hanuman will soon appear. To-day, if you use the common mental images prevalent in India, though you speak in the foreign tongue of English, you get to a nearness with the people that nothing else will achieve. And it matters not where you speak, Bengal or Bombay, Punjab or Madras, you will find that this inner India is the same everywhere, thinking the same thoughts, aspiring with the same dreams.

One reason for the similarity of mental images throughout India is the influence of the sacred language of Sanskrit. What Latin was to Europe of the Middle Ages, so Sanskrit has been for at least two thousand years for India—indeed, up to the coming of English. All worship was in Sanskrit; each Samskāra or sacrament was valid only if performed with the prayers of the sacred language. The religious texts, the philosophies, the works on culture, were all in Sanskrit; even the great epics and dramas, known by the masses in the vernaculars, were originally in Sanskrit. The "Language of the Gods" is inseparable

from the Aryan culture of India, and to-day it is Sanskrit which is at the base of all the great languages (except the Dravidian) of India. Even to the Dravidian tongues, Sanskrit has contributed most of the terms of cultural studies.

3. *A Common Homeland.*—It is difficult to explain fully, to those born outside the Hindu pale, the almost mystic conception which is a Hindu's idea of India. In the twentieth century we do not believe in "Gods," and even if a Christian believes in God, He is somehow not so near to earth as a Hindu conceives Him. Gilbert Chesterton has somewhere said that in England the one thing you must not assume about God is that He is something real, "like a tiger". In India, it is exactly the reverse; God is there real, "like a tiger". And furthermore, Gods and Goddesses are real, like tigers. With this sense of the invisible as God's more "glorious garment rare" than the visible, there has ever been in India the vivid realisation of India as the Chosen Land of all the Gods of the Cosmos. It is, of course, a supreme conceit, but it has given to India, in the minds of her children, a divine radiant quality that had its parallel perhaps only among the Greeks of Athens.

This India "of the Gods" has been, and is, less the mere geographical India than certain sacred places in India, each thought of as enshrining the spiritual forces of the sacred Motherland. A man may have been born in a small village, and died there, knowing but a small radius of ten or twenty miles of *geographical* India; and yet, from his "second birth" at seven, he has known in his mind of the real India. For every day, it has been his religious sacrament to repeat the names of the seven sacred rivers of India—Ganges, Jumna, Godavery, Sarasvati, Nerbudda, Indus, Kavery. His imagination has flitted from north to south, from east to west, and he has known of All India. From childhood he has heard of the sacred places and longed to go to them, and, it may be, has actually visited them all—Dwāraka in Cutch, Puri in Bengal, Badrināth in the Himalayas, and Rāmeshwaram in Madras. He has *not* thought of India by Provinces, but in mountain ranges and as bounded by oceans, by the Indian Ocean in the south at Rāmeshwaram, the Bay of Bengal in the east at Puri, the Arabian Sea in the west at Somnāth and Dwāraka, and by the Himalayas in the north.

To the Hindu, the old centres of religion are not mere places to "visit," for sight-seeing purposes; they are centres of purification, expiation, and regeneration. To hear of them, to think of them, is to sense something of the inner vitality of the "land of the Gods". Then, to visit Kāshi (Benares) or Vrindāvan, the sacred birthplace of Shri Krishna—it is difficult to describe the exaltation conveyed to Hindus by these names. Even to-day, many an old man and woman come to these places, there to live months or years, as the Gods will, till death finds them in the place of purification, for heaven there is nearer for them than in any other place in India. Because of all these age-long associations, the vast extent of geographical India has ever had a unity in the Hindu's mind. It is the sacred Āryavarta, Bhāratavarsha, Jambudvīpa, of his fathers. Differences of dialect have not mattered, except for commerce; the "land of the Gods" stays supreme, a unity, not a diversity, over the territorial divisions into which Indian dynasties or foreign conquerors have broken up India.

It is because of these three elements—a common worship, or common set of mental symbols, and a

common territory of culture—that India has had for ages the subjective sense of Nationality. So strong has been this national sense that though, from Alexander to Clive, a dozen or more foreign conquerors have had dominion over India, India has not been really affected by them. In the words of the *Bhagavad Gita*, like sense-impacts, they "come and go, impermanent," while India has gone on from age to age.

What is happening to-day in India is the attempt to express this old subjective national sense of India in an objective form. That Indians are swiftly learning to do this, is due to the fact that they have but to create the *form*. In most young countries of the West to-day, not only have they had to create a form but it has been also necessary to create the life too. This was largely the case in the making of modern Italy. In India the *life* is already existing, a life which, for a while, was submerged in the first contacts with Western civilisation, but which is welling up in illimitable measure, to make forms of culture for India's life as a Nation in the comity of nations. Political agitation in India is only one expression of this welling-up life; social reform, new

tendencies in art, religious revivals, fraternisation of caste and caste, with "cosmopolitan dinners," the entry of women into public life, the organisation of the workers into Trade Unions, these and many other activities are also expressions of the hidden life of Āryavarta as she now makes new cultural forms.

There are thousands of Indians to-day, sober-minded and by temperament averse to "agitation," who yet have heartily taken part in political agitation simply because, thoroughly aware of the true life of Indian culture, and treasuring it in their heart of hearts, they realise that that culture can only be preserved for the future by creating for India new and democratic modes of political self-expression. The Reform Bill of to-day, or others to come, cannot *make* the Indian Nation; it is already made, how long "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary". That India, given fair play, can make a success of Self-government, is obvious when we understand the subjective but strong national character of India's life. Like the Sleeping Beauty awakened by a kiss, so has India awakened by her contact with the West, not to be another than India,

but India herself, the "land of the Gods," where the Gods shall dictate henceforth the policies for men who are Divine Souls, not of an Āryavarta alone, but of a mighty Empire.

Did but the Empire know it, India is the "Cup," the Grail, into which shall be poured the Divine Drink for a thirsting humanity, which the Empire shall offer to the world. This is "the Day" of which India's sages have dreamed, for which her patriots, blindly or consciously, are sacrificing to-day. Whatever be the obstacles in her path, India will come to her own. When subjective nationality works to fashion an objective expression of its vigour, nothing can withstand it. For, always, a Nation is a Soul, not a body. Should that body be ravaged and destroyed and the Nation rendered bodiless, then the Soul waits to take new birth again, a restless ghost, haunting men's dreams, showing all things out of perspective, and making all the activities in the dispossessed people spiritually unprofitable.

With India, an objective Nation is being born for the first time, and subjective nationality descends to be born in objective national forms. The

descent may be swift or slow, helped by sympathy and understanding from friends, or hindered by the contumely and oppression of enemies. But Time is as naught when Spirit moulds Matter; the Inner Nation will force all things to recognise her as the Outer Nation too. "With God all things are possible." So, too, with the "Gods," who are His Agents. That is why, in spite of dark clouds hovering over geographical India, never a dawn broke more brightly over any land than to-day over the "land of the Gods". Every particle of India's dust, every blade of India's grass, is waiting for the noonday glory that is to be, yearning to contribute its tiny fraction of the hidden, pent-up spiritual vitality of India, to make of visible India the Channel of Divine Life which the invisible India has ever been.

This is the true, the wonderful mystery of India. She is not merely a land of fascinating, gorgeous, picturesque peoples, of tints and glows of colours unmatchable in other lands. She is a Soul, such a Soul as once in ten thousand years dwells with men to be their Guide and Blessing. Dimly the subconscious mind of even the peasant senses this wonder; more clearly does the beautiful

vision appear day by day before the imagination of old and young alike, who are sacrificing heart and brain for India's welfare. That is why India is like no other land in the world to-day.

THE GIFT OF INDIA TO ALL NATIONS

We have been trying to understand in what way the present events of the world are related to a Divine Plan of evolution. When we look round the world to-day, with all its turmoil, it is not easy to accept the conception that there is a plan, for there seems to be so much chaos and disorder, and so little of real method in the world's affairs. Nevertheless, if we look closely into what is happening, we shall be able slowly to disentangle out of the complexities certain facts which will lead us through the labyrinth into the centre. There are certain great conceptions that are slowly emerging out of events to-day, conceptions which are indeed not lived up to by those who profess them, but which are looked up to nevertheless by all. Of these conceptions, one which has emerged out of the great War is that each people has a value for the world civilisation. Slowly, as the War proceeded, the idea that each people, however small in economic value, yet had something of great consequence for the welfare of the whole world, has steadily gained

ground. When to-day any nation is being oppressed, or any people is claiming to make itself into a nation, there is a warmer sympathy with their hopes and a greater indignation at their oppression than most people had before the War. Each people has a value, and no people, however small, must now be destroyed in the warring policies of Empires. That is the first great conception which stands out, which, as I said, is not being lived up to, but which yet is being looked up to.

The second great idea arises out of the first, and that is, that all nations can do their work better together, in a spirit of co-operation, with a greater efficiency for mankind in general, than by competition. That thought is crystallised in the League of Nations, for that League is only the expression, in terms of nations, of that spirit of co-operation which we are all beginning slowly to accept as a principle in life.

The third great idea which stands out almost luminously, so that all can see, is that of Democracy. We are beginning to realise, even here in India, that henceforth the administration of a people must not be by the will of an individual king or of an

oligarchy. In the twentieth century and in the days to come, the old conceptions of monarchy have to go. Democracy we now accept as the guiding principle in the administration of nations. But what is the root-idea underlying democratic thought? It is that, in a nation, a law by which people are to live must be the expression of the Will of the People. That is the idea for which every people is struggling. This idea of democracy has been briefly and tersely stated in America as the Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people". Yet it was only three months ago that for the first time there was even in America a full recognition that the word "people" included half the citizens, the women. Democracy has needed one hundred and twenty-one years to put into practice the fundamental conception that "the people" is composed not only of the men in the nation but also of the women.

The existing conception of democracy which we have to-day we get largely from the French Revolution, which began in 1789. The French Revolution proclaimed as the gospel of democracy three great ideas—Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. The equality we have as the result of the Revolution is

not the equality that was dreamed of by the dreamers of the time, but merely legal equality. When we come to fraternity, that is still a great dream. There is no fraternity certainly in France, any more than there is in any other nation. Then as to liberty, in a people it can never be absolute; the individual's action must always be circumscribed so that injury may not be done to his fellow-citizens. There cannot be such a thing as ideal, absolute liberty in any social organisation. In less than one hundred years of democratic working, there have been in France three republics, two empires and three kingdoms. Obviously, then, there is a curious lack of stability in democratic institutions, as they are worked out in France. There is still a party in France dreaming of bringing back the old kings of France, to save France from the evils from which she is suffering. I might also point to America to show that in many ways that Republic of the West has not given to the individual the place which the Constitution has dictated. There is not such a great value in the individual politically to-day in America, because the individual's political action is strictly circumscribed by various political organisations. In

many ways we find that, while in theory there could be nothing so perfect as the idea of democracy, in practice hitherto that ideal has only been a partial success. I want to emphasise that word "partial," because, while there has been a success in the sense that it is an improvement on older systems, that success is partial. Why? It is on the analysis of why there is only a partial success that my whole subject this morning is based.

Lamartine, who wrote about the events of the French Revolution, says concerning what truly makes a republic: "It is not everything, nor even the principal thing, for the Republic to govern by laws. You must govern by souls. But what governs souls? It is Truth." He means that if one is to make a success of a political institution of a new kind like a republic, one must go behind the mere outer forms, and try to realise certain great principles which he calls Truth. In thinking of a republic, people usually mean by it the best ways of expressing the will of the people, and the best method of administration. They try to conceive of institutions which will embody the will of the people. But no clear and precise attempt is made to understand the

individual himself, who is the fundamental unit of the people.

The new conception of the individual, as inseparable from the institutions with which he is going to be surrounded, has been brilliantly stated by Mr. Arundale in one of his charts on Education. It is this: "If you want to teach Krishna Sanskrit, you must not only know Sanskrit but you must also know Krishna." There we have the great principle that, if you are going to have a democratic regime which is the expression of the individual's will, you must first understand what is the individual.

Now it is there that at once India enters on the scene in this great age of democracy, for India has a gift to give—a new conception of what the individual is. If India has subsisted for so many thousands of years, it is because she has to give this conception. She has been preserved among the nations, because the work she has to do is not a work of mere self-glorification, as sometimes seems to be the case in the minds of our political propagandists. It is rather to give a great gift to mankind, and in giving, to fulfil her part in the Great Plan. I am bound to tell you that this conception, that India

has a great gift to offer to the world, is not fully recognised to-day. It may take many generations before the duty is recognised. I would not like any of you to go away with the idea that because I hold such a high conception of the work that India is to do, therefore I am utterly blind to the deficiencies of Indians, or that I do not recognise the obstacles in the way.

The conception which India is to offer of the individual is bound to be a very complex one, for the reason that India is to-day a very complex country. During the last few years, the political upheaval here has done this much, it has abolished narrow methods in Indian thought. We think in these days of the work to be done for India, not in terms of the Hindu or the Musalman, but in terms of Indians. That is one step forward to the recognition of the complexity of her dreams and of her life. Now the complex conception of the individual which India has to offer, grows out of five streams which exist in India to-day—all integral parts of the inner life and thought of the people. These five streams are five great religious currents running hitherto side by side, and now slowly converging. Each of them

gives one conception of the individual, and contributes something to the fuller conception of the individual of the future. The five streams are the Vedic or the Hindu, the Jain, the Buddhist, the Musalman, and lastly the Parsi stream. The Parsis have come to us with their old heritage of Persia, and we have made them our own. The Musalmans came in a wave of conquest and brought their civilisation, but them too we have made our own. In these days, when the typical Indian thinks of his people and his country, it is with an inclusive thought of all these types—the Hindu, the Jain, the Buddhist, the Musalman and the Parsi—as blended together into a single conception of the Indian. We have, it is true, a certain number of Indian Christians. But, as that religion is a Western religion—for to us in these days Christianity embodies Western civilisation—I think without any sense of exclusiveness I can for the moment leave it out of this Indian conception, not forgetting that Christianity is the religion which has specially emphasised that the individual is to express himself in life with service as his dominant theme. You will then keep that at the back of the mind, while I speak of the fivefold conception which

India is to give of the individual. There are also other conceptions like Judaism, for we have some Indian Jews in this land. But I am concentrating my thought on those which I consider rather more intimately connected with India's thoughts and dreams to-day than is Judaism or Christianity.

The conception which exists in each of the five streams of religious thought in India is one which perhaps only a few here and there are beginning to realise as essential for the welfare of the future. Zoroastrianism has a magnificent spiritual and ethical teaching. There is in Zoroastrianism a conception of the individual which has not been developed, but which is essential to the work which Parsis have to do for the world. You have it in the thought that each individual is a Champion of God. The universe is the place where there is continually taking place a great struggle between good and evil. Each moment there is a struggle taking place between the two, and each Zoroastrian must identify himself with God's army in this struggle. He must have a definite work each moment, planning to transform and abolish all evil. His work in life is not merely to live as a pious, charitable man, dreaming of the heaven to come

which is his, but rather as the active fighter for God. A Zoroastrian cannot be a real follower of Ahura Mazda unless in every fibre of his being he is a reformer. He is not called upon to be ascetic and renounce the things of this world, but rather to live in it as the active champion of God.

Passing on to what India has received from Muhammadan civilisation, we have it in the unique conception by one Muhammadan of a fellow Muhammadan as a brother. For the first time Muhammadanism brings out the thought, though it is circumscribed to the members of the Faith, that within that Faith each Musalman is a brother. Islam has made a greater success, in the application of the thought of Brotherhood, than any other of the existing religions. Now has come the time for the development of that idea for the future, that each man who does God's work, whether he is of the Faith or not, is a brother.

The conception of the individual according to Buddhism is that each man by his own striving must tread the Path to Perfection. It is in Buddhism that we have the assertion of human liberty far more magnificently than in any other religion of the world. Free of priests and books and ceremonies, looking at the

problem of existence for himself, each man can tread the Way of Liberation.

Jainism has, as one of its practical principles of daily life, *Ahimsa* or harmlessness. It is the religion which has emphasised more than any other the idea of man as the protector of the lower orders of creation. It is the religion which has given the conception that it is possible for a man to struggle in a world of competition and yet succeed by absolutely harmless ways, that it is possible to dominate the greatest things of life, not by outer force but by an inner soul-force which wins without oppression. The conception of man as the protector, who wins by ways of passive resistance and tenderness, is essentially characteristic of Jainism.

The Hindu conception of the individual was called in the old days the *Rahasya*, the "Secret". It is the doctrine of the Immanence of God. It is the idea that the individual is not less than God Himself. It means that when you look at a person, however low and humble he may be, before you is the wonderful image of the Majesty of God. No religion has proclaimed so fully, so clearly and so magnificently, that each man is the Embodiment of the Godhead. Do

not for the moment think of the infringements of this great Truth which exist in Hindu religion as practised to-day. As Theosophists, let us contemplate the jewel which was put there by the Jewel-maker, and not examine the dust of ages which has settled upon the jewel's setting. In the Vedic conception we have the idea that in some mysterious fashion each individual —each man, each woman, high-caste, low-caste and out-caste—has within him the nature of God. You know how that Divine Nature is described in the *Gita*:

> Wonderful, wistful to contemplate!
>   Difficult, doubtful to speak upon!
> Strange and great for tongue to relate,
>   Mystical hearing for every one:
> Nor wotteth man this, what a marvel It is,
>   When seeing, and saying, and hearing are done!

Though in India democracy has begun, its success is only partial as yet. It is bound to be partial, because of the lack of recognition of the new conception of the individual. On this new conception of the individual depends the success of the great League of the Nations of the world. The conception of the individual is in the West still either economic or military. The conception of the poor in the West is that somehow they have not been able to do their

duty or adapt themselves to circumstances, and so have failed in life. But here, look at the five millions of Sannyasis and homeless wanderers who beg their daily bread from door to door. In this country they are not looked down upon as wastrels who prey upon the honest toil of the industrious workers. We, here in India, have realised that absence of possessions is no standard of a man, and that a man may beg his daily bread, seemingly indeed a parasite on the body economic, and yet be of the greatest value for the community. A community does not live by bread alone. "Honest toil" may not be so very fruitful to a nation, unless there are just ideas in the "honest" toiler's brain. A poor man, a non-producer of material wealth, may often be a greater source of national vitality than a Trust magnate. As brain is more productive in the long run than hand, so is soul more productive than brain. It is this non-economic conception of the individual which is ingrained in every Indian.

Happily the conception of the individual by his military value is being steadily denounced in country after country. We are still far off from that standard of ancient China, following which a Chinese father committed suicide when his son adopted the soldier's

profession, for no greater disgrace could come on a parent than to have his son enter that most disreputable of Chinese professions. Yet daily more and more of thoughtful men and women are realising the utter wastefulness and cruelty of war. The military conception of the individual has almost gone.

But after the false economic and military conceptions of the individual have been cast aside, a new conception must take their place. It is this conception which India can give out of her religious traditions. That conception is complex, as I have already described; when summed up, it says that the individual is at one and the same time a Champion of God, a Brother to all that lives, a Master of his destiny, a Protector of all weaker than himself, and the Godhead revealed. Without this conception of the individual, democracy is a chimera, and all our attempts at reconstruction will be only partly successful. The reconstruction will be partial, because we shall revert to the old economic or military conception of the individual. As we think of man, so is the future of our civilisation.

When this conception of the individual is accepted by us here in India; when the five streams of

religious thought are blended together; when we who live in this ancient land look upon each other in terms, not of caste or creed or religion, but in terms of a common, wonderful, complex individuality; then India will be able to give her great gift to the world. We were told by the President of the Theosophical Society, in her lectures on the four previous mornings, that the Divine Plan has decreed that there shall be a Federation of the World, where all nations, great and small, shall sit together in one House of Nations, each respecting the other, and all doing a common work in a spirit of consecration to the Divine Plan. But that World Federation cannot appear on the scene till the British Empire is first federated. The smaller federation must be the model for the larger to come later. But the federation of the peoples who are now under the British Crown must not be into a mere "British" Empire; it must be an Indo-British Commonwealth. As there is no British "Empire" without India, so will there be no true Commonwealth till India's five streams permeate the ideals of Imperial manhood and womanhood.

There is a new transformation taking place in the world; it is nothing less than the revelation of God

in all peoples. We say that there is a sort of Divinity which overshadows a consecrated monarch; but every one of us is crowned by God with His nature, and each people is a mirror of His wonderful Life. Whether the great transformation be slow or swift depends upon the speed with which the Indo-British Commonwealth is fashioned, and the fashioning of that body depends upon the awakening of India to do her work in the Great Plan. Her work is not to build material empires of a day, but a spiritual empire of ages. On India's realising what is the world-message which she is to give hangs the future of the world. If only Indians will awaken, and blend the five streams that are flowing in their land, and proclaim *by living* this new conception of the individual, then Democracy will indeed be the greatest of blessings. But not till then. The gospel of Democracy must be "*Emmanuel—God with us*". India can show that this gospel is not a dream but an ever-living reality. It is by telling the world that the birthright of every man and every woman is to be Divine, to be a Protector, to be Free, to be a Brother, and to be the Champion of all that is good and true.

Printed by J. R. Aria at the Vasanta Press, Adyar, Madras.